



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

two poets' lives, the features of their temperaments, the style of their work. More certain proof of Herrick's literary kinship to Horace may be found in his actual indebtedness to Horace's poetry—a debt varying from acknowledged translation of whole ode to chance phrase or word in solution in his verse.

Familiar is Herrick's rendering of A dialogue betwix't Horace and Lydia. In theme eminently suited to Herrick's own genius, this light-hearted lovers' quarrel receives graceful and charming treatment at his hands and his four line strophe, in spite of its rhyming couplets, produces not unsuccessfully the effect of the original. Another poem which shows conspicuous Horatian influence is typical of Herrick's method of using his prototype. This is the one on his age, dedicated to his peculiar friend, Mr. John Wickes, under the name of Posthumous. Seven of the first stanzas of this poem contain imitations of Horace. In the first, besides the name Posthumous, the first four lines are taken from Horace, C. 2. 14. 1-4:

Ah Posthumous! Our years hence flye
And leave no sound; nor piety,
Or prayers, or vow
Can keep the wrinkle from the brow.

The last two lines are from another ode, I. 28. 19-20:

None, Posthumous, co'd ere decline
The doome of cruel Proserpine.

The second stanza returns to C. 2. 14. 21-24, the first three lines being virtually direct translation:

The pleasing wife, the house, the ground
Must all be left, no one plant found
To follow thee
Save only the Curst-Cipresse tree.

The third and fourth stanzas have imbibed part of C. 4. 7:

We see the Seas
And moons to wain;
But they fill up their ebbs again:
But vanisht, man
Like to a Lilly-lost, nere can,
Nere can, repullulate, or bring
His dayes to see a second spring.
But on we must, and thither tend,
Where Anchus and rich Tullus blend
Their sacred seed.

The fifth stanza is indebted to C. 2. 11 for
Crown we our Heads with Roses then,
And 'noint with Tirian Balm.

The sixth stanza owes the "roofs of Cedar" and Baiae to C. 2. 18. The "shining salt-seller" of the next stanza comes from C. 2. 16 and the line "We'll eate our Beane" surely is a reminiscence of Horace's famous bean that was the kinsman of Pythagoras and helped to make a feast fit for gods. Here then in seven stanzas of one poem are seven quotations from Horace or allusions to his poetry.

VASSAR COLLEGE. ELIZABETH HAZELTON HAIGHT.
(To be concluded.)

REVIEW

Cicero's Letters. Selected and edited by Ernst Riess.

New York: The Macmillan Co. (1910). Pp. 59 + 396. 60 cents.

This book is intended for freshmen. It belongs to a series which undertakes to combat the temptation of translations by furnishing such commentaries on the Latin works read in colleges as younger students require for the interpretation of the text, without the usual erudite or pedantic superfluities that only bewilder the undergraduate. Dr. Riess urges the reading of Cicero's letters by freshmen on the ground that "after the mainly grammatical treatment of Latin in the secondary school, the students need most to be awakened to the fact that the Roman authors were men of flesh and blood". He believes that the students' acquaintance with the Ciceronian Age gives a *ποῦ στῶ*. It would be easy to add other reasons, but perhaps no considerations will entirely remove the prejudice in favor of beginning the college course with some formal prose work. Dr. Riess's book is made up of 49 pages of introduction, 267 pages of text, and 120 pages of notes. There are, besides, tables showing the traditional numbering of each letter of the selection and an index of important proper names.

The amount of text included is so large (more letters are given than in Watson's ponderous volume) that the instructor will be called upon to make a further selection for himself—perhaps not so much a burden as an opportunity. It is between seven and eight times as great as the text of the Cato Maior, nearly twice as great as the combined twenty-first and twenty-second books of Livy. Of the 166 letters, 44 are from the collection *Ad Atticum*, two from the *Ad Quintum Fratrem* group. In the selections from the *Ad Familiares* there are twenty letters from fourteen writers other than Cicero, and letters from Cicero to thirty-five different persons. It will be inferred from these figures that the various sides of Cicero's correspondence are well represented, and a closer examination of the contents of the book will justify the inference. Dr. Riess has made his choice with discrimination and discretion. Occasionally, indeed, one may disagree with him: for instance, regarding *Quint. Frat. 1.1*. If the length and the style of this letter do not constitute a sufficient objection to including it in such a selection, then perhaps the similar essay-letter of Quintus, the *Commentariolum Petitionis*, ought also to have been given a place. The order of the letters is, of course, chronological.

The introduction treats these subjects: History of Letter-writing down to the Time of Cicero, Cicero's Letters (with brief biographies of his correspondents of his own household, and of Atticus, Caelius, and Trebatius), The Extant Collection, Writing a Letter in Antiquity, Language and Style

of the Letters, Chronology of Cicero's Life. This part of the book is supposedly intended, like the rest, for the student, not the teacher or scholar. The last two sections gather up into a coherent whole explanations and remarks scattered through the notes, and will be used only to bring out the general relations and significance of particular facts. The other sections must be capable of being read uninterruptedly and understandingly, if they are to do their part in interesting our freshman in classical antiquity. On the whole, this requirement is satisfied, but occasionally the way is blocked by a piece of erudition or disappears where some of the steps of an argument have been sacrificed to a desire for brevity.

The discussion of the publication of the *Epistulae ad Familiares* is not convincing, because of the omission of arguments which would have made the editor's reasoning plain. The conclusion that Book XV was not published with Books I-IX (and XIV and XVI) is rendered suspect by the statement concerning the dates of its letters, and no other reason for the separation is offered. Furthermore, mention of the fact that Tiro lived many years after the probable date of the appearance of the first collection is not the best foundation for a statement that a later editor collected Books X-XII. This is not the place to enter into the whole question, and I should not animadvert upon Dr. Riess's conclusions if they were given without argument or were consistent with the argument.

In what is said of the *sermo cotidianus* on pages xxxvii and xxxviii there are traces of the old confusion between the conversational speech of the cultured and the *sermo plebeius*. The treatment of the style of the letters shows something, too, of the almost universal tendency (even among reviewers) to overestimate the peculiarities of any style that happens to be under discussion. For instance, *sentina urbis*, *locus* (from the arena), and *quasi de caelo delapsus*, which are given as examples of Cicero's epistolary use of metaphor and comparison, are all found in the same figurative uses in the orations read in school. Indeed, most of the examples cited under this head can be duplicated or paralleled from formal prose. The metaphorical use of gladiatorial terms no more indicates colloquial Latin than "countered Marcellus's bill" (p. li) indicates colloquial English.

A great school was once happily characterized as a place where boys were taught to read the preface of a book. Nowadays students do not read even the introduction, and the usefulness of such a book as this depends almost entirely upon the nature of the notes. Dr. Riess tells us in his preface that his notes are elementary, and this they are in the main, as well as commendably rare and brief. There are, as in the foot-notes of the intro-

duction, a few references to learned German works not likely to be at the freshman's elbow or intelligible to him. On the other hand, a large proportion of the references to Latin literature are to works read in the schools. This constant backward look has possibilities of good that are usually neglected by editors. The scattered grammatical references take account only of Gildersleeve-Lodge. Where Dr. Riess forgoes comment, little is lost that cannot be made good by the teacher *viva voce*. One may perhaps even regret that he has not left somewhat more to the discretion of the individual teacher. Some surely would prefer that the student's attention should not be distracted by the identification of persons whose very names he will soon forget: e. g., in Att. 1.1, Cornificius, Caesonius, Aufidius, Palicanus.

There is some loose writing in the book, of which the following are extreme instances: "These are distinguished even by the superscription, which in the case of confidential correspondence gives merely the cognomen of the addressee, and is free and easy both in tone and content. *It* employs the *sermo cotidianus*" (p. xv); "which called forth the famous letter on the administration of provinces by his brother" (p. xxi); "at the risk of his life on the part of the aristocratic hotspurs" (p. liii). Various other faults of diction, evidently due in part to haste, should be corrected when an opportunity offers. To say that they tried to carry the war into Africa (p. liii) seems peculiarly inappropriate in its application of the proverb to the Pompeian remnant.

I add some random observations. Throughout the book letters are referred to by their traditional number, instead of their number in the selection, and this entails unnecessary labor upon those who would make use of the references. Some of the foot-notes (for instance, on pp. xiv and xv) are confused and confusing. Is it not too far a cry from the letters to Tiro to the conclusion that Cicero was "a kind friend of the lowly, the slaves, and freedmen" (p. xvii)? The *stilus* is not clearly described as a "copper pencil" (p. xxxiii). On p. xxxix there is a reference to a non-existent section 17 of Fam. 15.4. On p. xl reference is made to Fam. 9.2 for two accusatives after a verb of asking, but the reading in the text is *a te peto* after Cratander, not *te peto* with the manuscripts (the editor scrupulously avoids all discussion of textual questions). The statement that Cicero was made proconsul of Cilicia and the neighboring provinces (p. l) is misleading. What is meant is that the limits of the province extended beyond Cilicia proper. The date of Att. 3.4 is 58, not 59.

S. (p. 269) is a late abbreviation of *Sextus*. The extraordinary use of the names of the consuls in

Att. 1.2 should have been explained or left entirely unnoticed. Is there any warrant for saying that the formal salutation of Fam. 5.7 was officially prescribed? *Tres viri* is certainly not to be understood as the subject of *inimidi erant*, Att. 2.19.3. The tense of *essent*, Fam. 14.4.4, is not influenced by *abisset*, but both forms are determined by the idea of past time implied in *causa est*. The statement (p. 302) that the ancients never read "in our soundless way" is, to say the least, too sweeping. Only the tense of *abundares*, Fam. 7.10.2, is influenced by *placebat*; its mood would be subjunctive if the clause were direct. Of the *Ampius* of Fam. 3.7.5 it is said: "He had been proconsul of Asia, but may have had authority in a few Cilician towns". Is he not the praetor of De Domo 23 (*Ciliciam ad praetorem extra ordinem transtulisti*)? I cannot see in Fam. 16.1.1 any light on ancient medicine. Tiro seems to have been suffering from a disorder of the stomach, as Dr. Riess says, and Cicero complains in a later letter (Fam. 16.4) that soup had been given him by his physician. The words in 16.1 are best taken as referring to the retention of food by the stomach; they do not, in any case, necessarily imply a prolonged fast. Furthermore, it gives a one-sided impression to say that ancient medicine "cured illness largely by fasting or a very spare diet". Is not Fam. 4.5 the only extant letter of condolence on the death of Tullia? Fam. 5.14 might possibly be counted as another, but Dr. Riess's language implies that several such letters are extant. The note which explains *qui illius*, Fam. 4.5.6, as equivalent to *is enim* will be a hindrance to the understanding of the passage, rather than a help.

THE PHILIPS EXETER ACADEMY. JOHN C. KIRTLAND.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE ATLANTIC STATES

The programme of the annual meeting is as follows:

Friday Afternoon, April 21, at 2.30.

In McCosh Hall 10

Address of Welcome, by Professor Henry B. Fine, Dean of the University Faculty.

Response, by Mr. J. B. Hench, President of the Association.

Paper: Greek Medicine and the Cure-Inscriptions from Epidaurus, by Professor G. M. Whicher, Normal College, New York City.

Paper: A Witticism of Asinius Pollio, by Professor G. L. Hendrickson, of Yale University.

Paper: The Authorship of the Forcellini Lexicon, by Professor Charles E. Bennett, of Cornell University.

Paper: Preparatory Classics, by Professor Hamilton Ford Allen, of Washington and Jefferson College.

Recess (10 minutes).

Report of the Executive Committee; Report of the Secretary-Treasurer.

At 6.30, Dinner at the Princeton Inn. (\$1.00 per plate).

At the Dinner speeches will be made by President Patton, of the Princeton Theological Seminary, and Dean Andrew F. West, of Princeton University, Professor John C. Rolfe, of the University of Pennsylvania, and Professor Edward Delavan Perry, of Columbia University.

Friday Evening, April 21, at 9

In McCosh Hall 10

Greetings from The Classical Association of the Middle West and South, by Professor Frank J. Miller, of the University of Chicago.

Greetings from The Classical Association of New England, by Professor G. L. Hendrickson, of Yale University.

Paper (illustrated): The Roman Wall in Britain, by Professor John H. Westcott, of Princeton University.

Saturday Morning, April 22, at 9.30

In Murray Hall

Paper: Decimus Magnus Ausonius, by Miss Anna Pearl MacVay, of The Wadleigh High School, New York City.

Round Table: Discussion of Topics suggested by members. The members of the Association are requested to send to the Secretary as soon as possible questions they would like to hear discussed at the meeting. From these a selection will be made, and speakers will be secured, as far as possible, to open the various discussions.

Election of Officers; General Business.

At 1.30, Luncheon, for Members and Visitors, given by Princeton University, in University Hall.

Saturday Afternoon, at 3

In McCosh Hall 10

Paper: The Lyric Mood, by Professor Frank J. Miller, of the University of Chicago.

Paper (illustrated): Life of the Ancient Greeks, by Professor D. M. Robinson, of the Johns Hopkins University.

Paper: *O matre pulchra filia pulchrior*, by Dr. Edgar Howard Sturtevant, Barnard College.

Members who intend to be present at the dinner on Friday night and at the luncheon on Saturday are requested to notify, as soon as possible, Professor George D. Kellogg, 10 Nassau Street, Princeton.

LIFE OF THE ANCIENT GREEKS

Through an oversight proofs of the review by Professor Hendrickson in 4.174-175 were not sent to the author. The following corrections should be made: on page 174, in column 1, line 25, read 'literature' for 'history'; in column 2, line 38, read 'Aleander' for 'Alexander'; in column 2, line 57, read 'imbecility' for 'inability'.